UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,181	10/03/2003	Gordon Bowman	GLH 08-896329	2790

27667 7590 10/13/2006

HAYES, SOLOWAY P.C.
3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE, SUITE 140
TUCSON, AZ 85718

EXAMINER	
AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2179	

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/679,181	BOWMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas Augustine	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *18-19* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/19/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informalities: Selling errors: behaviours and categorising in lines 2-3 of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 18 recites the limitation "the generated function" in line 5 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

4. Claim 19 recites the limitation "the generated function" in line 5 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-17,20-21 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Macromedia, Extending Dreamweaver, (http://www.adobe.com/support/dreamweaver/extend.html).

As for independent claim 1, Macromedia teaches a system for controlling user interface features of a web application (pg.7, lines 4-6 of par. 1), the system comprising: a collection of user interface control elements (pg.7, lines 2-4 of par. 1), each control element comprising: a namespace (pg.23, line 3 of par.6 and pg.25, line 1 of par.1); common attributes for defining graphical features of the control element and for associating the control element with the internal state of the core control element (pg.27,first table and pg.208,par.2,line 1); other attributes for defining attributes that affect the intrinsic behavior of the control (pg.216,par.1,line1); and a skin template reference attribute for referencing a skin template (pg.236,par.1); a collection of skin templates comprising extensible markup language based markup (pg.253,last par. and pg.254 first par.) contained as children of a container element (pg.15, first table); and a collection of control element instructions for performing actions associated with the control elements (pg.15,first table; methods), each script associated with a control element (pg.205, lines 1-3 of par.2).

As for dependent claim 2, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 1, further comprising an initialization function for directing the processing one or more

control elements in a document object model, the initialization function comprising instructions for traversing each node in a document object model (pg.28, par.6) and for searching and calling functions associated with control elements having names following the predetermined naming convention (pg.28, last par.). Namespaces can be emulated to some extent by using a naming convention (page 25, line 1; prefix).

As for dependent claim 3, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the namespace follows a predetermined naming convention comprises having a constant prefix to the name of the element (page 25, line 1).

As for dependent claim 4, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the skin template reference attribute comprises a reference to the location of a skin template file (pg.254, par.1).

As for dependent claim 5, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the control element is associated with an extensible markup language based element (pg.253, last par.).

As for dependent claim 6, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 5, wherein the control element is a parent of an extensible markup language based element (pg.15, first table).

As for dependent claim 7, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 5, wherein the control element is a child of an extensible markup language based element (pg.15, first table).

As for dependent claim 8, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 2, further comprising: a collection of control attributes for adding to existing regular extensible markup language based elements in a document object model (pg.14, fig.1 and pg.328, par.1), the control attributes following the predetermined naming convention (pg.328; dreamweaver.function ()); and a collection of control attribute instructions for performing actions associated with the collection of control attributes, each instruction associated with a control attribute (pg.329, par.1).

As for dependent claim 9, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 8, wherein the initialization function contains instructions for traversing each node in the document object model (pg.28, par.6) and for searching and calling functions associated with control elements and control attributes having names following the predetermined naming convention (pg.28, last par.). Namespaces can be emulated to some extent by using a naming convention (page 25, line 1; prefix).

As for dependent claim 10, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the collection of control elements comprises a markup language (pg.268, par.1).

As for dependent claim 11, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the common attributes comprise state attributes for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element (pg.15, table; nodes and pg.26 and 27,tables; states).

As for dependent claim 12, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the common attributes comprise one or more of: an identification attribute for referencing the control element (pg.329, par.1); a label attribute for associating text control (pg.25,table;name); a height attribute for specifies the height of the control element (pg.25,table;size); a disabled attribute for specifying whether the control element is disabled and cannot be used (pg.26,table;state); a state hover attribute for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state hover attribute used to override the appearance of a hover state as defined in a skin of the control element (pg.16, table; image and pg.236, par.1); a state focus attribute for specifying the identification of a<state> child element of the control element, the state focus attribute used to override the appearance of a focus state as defined in a skin of the control element (pg.17,table;select and pg.236, par.1); a state up attribute for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state up attribute used to override the appearance of an up state as defined in a skin of the control element (pg.16, table; image and pg.236, par.1); a state down attribute for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state

down attribute used to override the appearance of a down state as defined in a skin of the control element (pg.16, table; image and pg.236, par.1); a state hit attribute for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state hit attribute used to override the appearance of a hit state as defined in a skin of the control element (pg.16, table; checkbox and pg.236, par.1); a state disabled up attribute for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state disabled up attribute used to override the appearance of a disabled up state as defined in the skin of the control element (pg. 26,table; state and pg.236, par.1); and a state disabled down attribute for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state disabled down attribute used to override the appearance of a disabled down state as defined in a skin of the control element (pg. 26,table; state and pg.236, par.1).

As for dependent claim 13, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 12, wherein the set of control elements comprises one or more of: It is evident that the following: button, combo box, list box, list view, context menu, item, text box, slider, scrollbar and spin dial, are taught by Macromedia and thus only one will be analyzed in detail.

a dsvg:button control element for defining a control that is clicked to trigger an action (pg.16, object-button, event-onClick), the dsvg:button control element comprising: a

namespace following the predetermined naming convention (pg.14, line1 of last par.); the common attributes (pg.16,table 1-button); other attributes comprising: a toggle attribute for specifying whether the button is a toggle or a sticky button (pg.16,table 1, button –event – onClick); a group attribute for specifying the name of a group to which the button control element belongs (pg.15, table 1, alltags/elements); and a checked attribute for specifying whether the button control element is down/checked or up/unchecked (pg.16, table 1, button); a skin template reference attribute for specifying the location of a control element skin template (pg.254, par.1), the skin template reference settable to a uniform resource index (pg.254, par.1); and a customizable skin template comprising scalable vector graphics markup contained as children of a container element (pg.36, par.3 and (pg.15, first table);

As for dependent claim 14, Macromedia teaches a system for controlling user interface features of a web application (pg.7, lines 4-6 of par. 1), the system comprising: a collection of control element instructions for performing actions associated with the control elements, each instruction associated with a control element (pg.329, par.1); and an initialization function for directing the processing of one or more control elements in a document object model (pg.28, par.6 and last par.).

As for dependent claim 15, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 14, further comprising a collection of skin templates comprising extensible markup language based markup (pg.253, last par. and pg.254 first par.) contained as children of a

container element (pg.15, first table).

As for dependent claim 16, Macromedia teaches a method of controlling user interface features of a web application, the method comprising the steps of: searching for a designated user interface control element in a document object model; and calling a script associated with the designated control element (pg.28, par. "traversing nodes" and "getting node data").

As for dependent claim 17, Macromedia teaches the method as claimed in claim 16, wherein the step of searching includes the steps of: traversing each node in the document object model (pg.28, par.8); and determining whether an element has a name which follows a designated naming convention (pg.28, par.8; node.name).

As for dependent claim 20, Macromedia teaches the method as claimed in claim 16, further comprising the steps of: searching for a designated attribute in an element in a document object model; and calling a script associated with the designated attribute (pg.28, last par.).

As for dependent claim 21, Macromedia teaches the method as claimed in claim 20, wherein the step of searching for a designated attribute comprises the steps of: searching attributes of an element in a document object model; determining whether an element attribute has a name which follows a designated naming convention (pg.19;

"getElementsByTagName (tagName)"). Obtaining attributes from tags, the tags will also act as a prefix for elements, which belong to a certain attribute(s).

As for dependent claim 25, Macromedia teaches a method of controlling user interface features of a web application (pg.9, lines 1-2 of par.2), the method comprising the steps of: adding a behavior element as a child of a user interface control element (pg.216, "dom.addBehavior ()"); receiving an event which is equal to an event attribute setting in the behavior element (pg.217, "dom.getBehavior()", where onClick attribute is equal an event to opening a script event this event is received); and calling a script associated with the behavior element (pg.223,fig.1).

As for independent claim 26, Macromedia teaches a method of creating a customizable user interface control element having expected behaviors (pg.10, par.1 and 5), the method comprising the steps of: categorizing user interface controls into fundamental core controls (pg.31, line 2-3 of par.1); determining variations of a core controls (pg.16, table 1); determining common attributes of the core control (pg.16, table 1); determining fundamental states for the core control (pg.16, table 1); determining how to allow for absolute positioning of objects the core control (pg.35, par.1); determining how to allow for absolute customization of appearance of the core control; assigning a reference link to the core control (pg.36, par.3-4); determining templates for skins to allow for the absolute customization of appearance of the core control (pg.254, par.1); determining

how to associate behaviors to the core control (pg.36, par.4); and creating a core control element (pg.36, par.1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 18-19 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Macromedia in view of Cain (US 6,014,138).

As for dependent claim 18, the method as claimed in claim 16, wherein the step of calling a script includes the steps of (note claim 16 above). Macromedia does not specifically mention dynamically generating a function name, passing an object, retrieving the attributes or performing a function having a generated name. However in the same field of endeavor Cain teaches dynamically generating a function name associated with the designated element (col. 12, lines 12-13); passing an object associated with the designated element as a parameter of the generated function (fig. 4H); retrieving the attributes of the object (col.12, lines 29-31); and performing a function stored in memory having the generated function name (fig.4H-I).

As for dependent claim 19, the method as claimed in claim 18, wherein the step of dynamically generating includes the steps of (note claims 16 and 18 above). Macromedia teaches determining if the name of the designated element contains a designated prefix (pg.25, par.1). Macromedia does not specifically mention generating a function name; assigning an object or assigning predetermined instructions. However in the same field of endeavor Cain teaches generating a function name comprising of the name of the designated element (col.12, lines 12-13); assigning an object associated with the designated element as the parameter of the function (fig.4H); and assigning predetermined instructions of the designated element as steps for the function to perform (fig.4H-I). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Cain into the method of Macromedia; this is true because Cain's methods solve the same problem of Macromedia's of custom

building a graphical operator interface (col.1, lines 23-25).

As for dependent claim 22, Macromedia teaches the method as claimed in claim 21, wherein the step of calling a script includes the steps of: determining if the name of the designated attribute contains a designated prefix (pg.19, note claim 21 above); Macromedia does not specifically mention generating a function name, assigning an attribute ,object or predetermined instructions. However in the same field of endeavor Cain teaches generating a function name comprising of the name of the designated attribute (col. 12, lines 12-13, i.e. "click"); assigning an object associated with the designated attribute as the parameter of the function name (fig.4H); and assigning predetermined instructions of the designated attribute as steps for a function having the function name to perform (fig.4H-I). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Cain into the method of Macromedia; this is true because Cain's methods solve the same problem of Macromedia's of custom building a graphical operator interface (col.1, lines 23-25).

As for dependent claim 23, Macromedia teaches the method as claimed in claim 20 (note the discussion of claim 20 above). Macromedia does not specifically mention in the steps of calling a script. However in the same field of endeavor Cain teaches the steps of calling a script comprising: dynamically generating a function name associated with the designated attribute (col. 12, lines 12-13); passing an object associated with the designated attribute as a parameter of the generated function name (fig.4H); receiving

the attributes of the object (col.12, lines 29-31); and performing a function stored in memory having the generated function name (fig.4H-I). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Cain into the method of Macromedia; this is true because Cain's methods solve the same problem of Macromedia's of custom building a graphical operator interface (col.1, lines 23-25).

As for dependent claim 24, the method as claimed in claim 18, wherein the step of dynamically generating includes the steps of (note claims 16 and 18 above). Macromedia teaches determining if the name of the designated attribute contains a designated prefix (pg.25, par.1). Macromedia does not specifically mention generating a function name; assigning an object or assigning predetermined instructions; However in the same field of endeavor Cain teaches generating a function name comprising of the name of the designated attribute (col.12, lines 12-13); assigning an object associated with the designated attribute as the parameter of the function (fig.4H); and assigning predetermined instructions of the designated attribute as steps for the function to perform (fig.4H-I). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Cain into the method of Macromedia; this is true because Cain's methods solve the same problem of Macromedia's of custom building a graphical operator interface (col.1, lines 23-25).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Bowers, Clarke – (US 2003/0203342 A1): Customizable Templates
- Claussen, Christopher – (US 6,981,212 B1): XML Custom DOM Tags

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-272-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571)272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

N.Augustine
10/03/2006

Nicholas Augustine
Examiner
AU: 2179

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER